

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are currently pending in the application. Claim 2 is hereby cancelled. New claims 7-19 are presented for consideration.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC §102 as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,730,230 (Helfrick). Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 USC §103 as obvious over Helfrick in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,959,824 to Schultz et al (Schultz). Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 USC §103 as obvious over Helfrick in view of Schultz, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,255,139, to von Huene et al (von Huene). Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 USC §103 as obvious over Helfrick in view of Schultz, and further in view of Golikov et al (Golikov). Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 USC §103 as obvious over Helfrick in view of Schultz, von Huene, and Golikov.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1 and 3-6 and favorable consideration of new claims 7-19 are requested.

The Examiner has objected to the specification based upon a typographical error. Appropriate amendment has been made to overcome this objection. Additional changes have been made throughout the detailed description to correct typographical errors and provide language directly corresponding to that in the amended claims. No new matter has been introduced. Approval of the specification changes is requested.

Claim 1, as amended, characterizes the generator as comprising a coil arranged so as to encircle a magnetic storage device inserted in the insertion cavity and a direct-current power supply circuit for exciting the coil. The main body of the eraser comprises a casing of a box shape having a front end with an opening, with the case functioning as the magnetic body. The casing accommodates a hollow coil spool with an outer periphery and an internal space with a front opening. The internal space functions as the insertion cavity. The coil is wound around the outer periphery of the hollow coil spool. The front opening to the internal space and the opening in the front end of the casing are arranged so that a magnetic storage device is directed through: a)

the front opening to the internal space; and b) the opening in the front end of the casing, into the insertion cavity.

Helfrick and Schultz do not individually, or in combination, teach or suggest both a casing functioning as a magnetic body and a hollow coil spool as claimed. von Huene and Golikov do not teach or suggest this structure in any combination with Helfrick and/or Schultz.

Von Huene lacks a disclosure of a casing defining a corresponding magnetic body.

The pertinence of Golikov is not understood. Enclosed is an English language Abstract for Russian Patent RU2041556, the original of the document cited by the Examiner. Golikov's device is an AC to DC converter. AC voltage, shown at the top of Fig. 2, is applied from the left side of Fig. 1, with a laminated DC, at the bottom of Fig. 2, taken out from the right side. Golikov only discloses capacitors (in ripple filters 3, 4) for lamination and fails to disclose a switching device for discharging and charging a capacitor.

Accordingly, claim 1 is believed allowable.

Claims 3-6 and new claims 7-18 depend cognately from claim 1 and recite further significant structural detail to further distinguish over the art applied by the Examiner.

For example, claim 4 characterizes the lid as functioning together with the casing as the magnetic body. With this arrangement, magnetic field lines are confined and potentially densely present so as to obtain an intense and uniform erasing effect. No corresponding lid is disclosed to cooperate with a corresponding casing in the prior art to make possible a like operating characteristic.

Claim 7 characterizes the magnetic storage device, introduced in claim 7, as contained entirely within the insertion cavity.

Claim 9 characterizes the magnetic body and lid as cooperatively fully enclosing the cavity.

These limitations highlight the structure that confines the magnetic field lines for intense erasing, which capability through a like structure is not taught or suggested in the cited art.

Claim 9 is similar to claim 1 but does not require a hollow coil space. Claim 19 is otherwise believed allowable for the reasons advanced relative to the allowability of claim 1.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1 and 3-6, favorable consideration of new claims 7-19, and allowance of the case are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
John S. Mortimer, Reg. No. 30,407

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ,
CLARK & MORTIMER
500 W. Madison St., Suite 3800
Chicago, IL 60661
(312) 876-1800

Date: Aug 3, 2006